



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,932	03/30/2004	Peter E. Hart	20412-08383	7930
758	7590	08/12/2005	EXAMINER	
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			THOMPSON, JAMES A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/814,932	HART ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
James A. Thompson	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2004 and 28 December 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/28/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the printed output" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 16, 21, 24-25, 41-42 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723).

Regarding claims 1 and 41: Sugiyama discloses a system (figure 1 of Sugiyama) for printing (column 6, lines 19-26 of Sugiyama) time-based media from a media source (column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama), the system comprising an interface (figure 1 (11) of Sugiyama) for receiving the time-based media from a

media source (column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama); a multimedia processing system (figure 1(12-16,26,28-29) of Sugiyama) coupled to the interface to receive the time-based media (as clearly shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama), the multimedia processing system determining (column 3, lines 57-63 of Sugiyama) an electronic representation of the time-based media (figure 4 and column 4, lines 25-31 of Sugiyama); and a first output device (figure 1 (18-20) of Sugiyama) in communication with the multimedia processing system to receive the electronic representation (as clearly shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama), the first output device producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media (figure 4 and column 4, lines 30-35 of Sugiyama). The multimedia processing system corresponds to the system shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama that performs the actual processing of the time-based media data. This excludes portions such as the video data interface (figure 1(11) of Sugiyama), the user interface (figure 1(21-25) of Sugiyama), the output printing system (figure 1(30-33) of Sugiyama), and the output display system (figure 1(18-20) of Sugiyama).

Further regarding claim 41: The system of claim 1 performs the method of claim 41.

Regarding claim 2: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system further determines a printed representation of the time-based media data (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 3: Sugiyama discloses a second output device (figure 1(31-33) of Sugiyama) in communication with the multimedia processing system to receive the printed representation (as clearly shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama), the second output device producing a corresponding printed output

Art Unit: 2624

from the representation of the time-based media (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 16: Sugiyama discloses that the interface comprises a video port (figure 1("Video Signal") and column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claims 21 and 47: Sugiyama discloses that the media source comprises a video camcorder (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 24: Sugiyama discloses that said multimedia processing system comprises a video stream processor (figure 1(15) and column 3, lines 26-32 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 25: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system comprises a video key frames extractor (figure 1(12) and column 3, lines 20-29 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 42: Sugiyama discloses determining a printed representation of the time-based media (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama); and generating a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the time-based media (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2624

6. Claims 4-6 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Wendelken (US Patent 6,193,658 B1).

Regarding claim 4: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the printed output is generated on a video paper.

Wendelken discloses generating a printed output on video paper (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama and Wendelken are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of time-based digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically use video paper for the output print, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been that video paper is one of several useful means for generating a permanent record of video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Regarding claims 5 and 43: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the electronic output is stored on a media recorder.

Wendelken discloses storing an electronic output on a media recorder (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama and Wendelken are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of time-based digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the electronic output on a media recorder, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to keep a permanent record of the

Art Unit: 2624

video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 43.

Regarding claims 6 and 44: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the electronic output is stored on a removable storage device.

Wendelken discloses storing an electronic output on a removable storage device (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Video tapes and optical discs are clearly removable storage devices.

Sugiyama and Wendelken are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of time-based digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the electronic output on a removable storage device, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to keep a permanent record of the video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Further, as is well-known in the art, using a *removable storage device* allows a user to switch recording devices, thus increasing the overall amount of data that can be stored and archived. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6 and 44.

7. Claims 7 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Wendelken (US Patent 6,193,658 B1), Hymel (US Patent

Art Unit: 2624

Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1) and Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1).

Further regarding claims 7 and 45: Wendelken discloses that said removable storage device (taught by Wendelken in the arguments regarding claims 6 and 44 above) is selected from one of a video tape and an optical disc (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama in view of Wendelken does not disclose expressly that the optical disc can specifically be either a DVD or a CD-ROM. Thus, Wendelken does not disclose expressly that the group from which said removable storage device is selected consists of not only a video tape, but also a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a flash card, a memory stick, and a computer disk.

Hymel discloses a removable storage device selected from among a video tape (as is well-known in the art, a digital camcorder uses a digital video (DV) cassette tape) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel), a DVD (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD-ROM (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), an audio cassette tape (audio cassette tape reader is a type of audio player, MP3 player is merely an example) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel), and a computer disk (para. 19, lines 8-9 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Wendelken is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a video cassette tape, a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, and a computer disk. The motivation for doing so would have been to

Art Unit: 2624

allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Wendelken.

Sugiyama in view of Wendelken and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a video tape, and a computer disk, but also a flash card and a memory stick.

Shieh discloses removable storage devices including a flash card (para. 18, lines 1-5 of Shieh) and a memory stick (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Wendelken and Hymel is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a flash card and a memory stick, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to output data to one of a plurality of different output devices, depending upon user need and desire (para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama in view of Wendelken and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 45.

8. Claims 8 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Chino (US Patent 6,118,888).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 8: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises an ultrasonic pen capture device.

Chino discloses an ultrasonic pen capture device (figure 3 (102i) and column 7, lines 14-16 of Chino).

Sugiyama and Chino are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to capture input data using an ultrasonic pen capture device, as taught by Chino. The suggestion for doing so would have been that an electronic pen is simply another useful output device that provides digital data a user may wish to obtain (figure 3 and column 6, lines 66-67 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 38: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said multiprocessing system comprises an image detection system.

Chino discloses an image detection system (figure 1(101) and column 6, lines 36-40 of Chino).

Sugiyama and Chino are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the image detection system taught by Chino as part of the overall multiprocessing system. The motivation for doing so would have been that detecting an image, in this case specific types of gazes, provides useful user input (column 6, lines 36-40 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Chino with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

Regarding claim 39: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said multiprocessing system comprises a face recognition system.

Chino discloses a face recognition system (figure 20(406) and column 24, lines 25-27 of Chino).

Sugiyama and Chino are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the face recognition system taught by Chino as part of the overall multiprocessing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine which particular user corresponds to the current user by recognition of the current user's face (column 26, lines 20-22 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 39.

Regarding claim 40: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said multiprocessing system comprises a speech recognition system.

Chino discloses a speech recognition system (column 29, lines 45-47 of Chino).

Sugiyama and Chino are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the speech recognition system taught by Chino as part of the overall multiprocessing system. The motivation for doing so would have been that human speech is a useful and natural

Art Unit: 2624

form of user input (column 1, lines 15-18 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 40.

9. Claims 9, 11-14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1).

Regarding claim 9: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a parallel port.

Shieh discloses as part of the background an input interface that comprises a parallel port (para. 5, lines 7-8 of Shieh).

Sugiyama and Shieh are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a parallel port for inputting the video data at said interface. The motivation for doing so would have been that parallel ports are compatible with flash card readers and the older 12 Mbit/sec computer equipment (para. 5, lines 1-9 of Shieh). Thus, using a parallel port is useful if older video and/or computer equipment is being used. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Regarding claims 11-12: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a serial interface, wherein said serial interface is an USB interface.

Art Unit: 2624

Shieh discloses an interface comprising a serial interface, wherein said serial interface is an USB interface (figure 2 and para. 17, lines 12-15 of Shieh).

Sugiyama and Shieh are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a USB interface for inputting the video data at said interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an increased data transfer rate, as compared with the older types of data transfer ports (para. 5, lines 7-12 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11-12.

Regarding claims 13-14: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a docking station, wherein the docking station is built into the system.

Shieh discloses a docking station (figure 3(10) and para. 17, lines 3-10 of Shieh). The flash card insertion port (figure 3(10) of Shieh) provides an interface through which a plurality of different devices can connect with the laptop computer shown in figure 3 of Shieh (para. 17, lines 3-10 of Shieh) and is thus what is more commonly referred to as a "docking station". Said docking station is built into the system (para. 17, lines 15-18 of Shieh).

Sugiyama and Shieh are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a built-in docking station as part of the interface, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide

Art Unit: 2624

an interface connection point for all the various types of peripheral devices that can be connected (para. 17, lines 6-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13-14.

Regarding claim 18: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a removable storage reader.

Shieh discloses an interface comprising a removable storage reader (para. 17, lines 1-3 of Shieh).

Sugiyama and Shieh are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a removable storage reader as part of the interface, as taught by Shieh. The suggestion for doing so would have been that flash memory is applicable to various digital products (para. 5, lines 12-14 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

10. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Stevens (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0010641 A1).

Regarding claim 10: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a wireless communication interface.

Stevens discloses an video data interface comprising a wireless communication interface (figure 3(110) and para. 36, lines 1-8 of Stevens).

Art Unit: 2624

Sugiyama and Stevens are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a wireless communication interface as said interface, as taught by Stevens. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to retrieve desired distributions of audio and video data over a controlled broadcast (para. 4, lines 1-5 of Stevens). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stevens with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

11. Claims 15, 20, 22, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1).

Regarding claim 15: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises an optical port.

Hymel discloses an interface that comprises an optical (infrared) port (para. 10, lines 13-14 of Hymel).

Sugiyama and Hymel are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use an optical port as part of said interface. The suggestion for doing so would have been that an optical port is one of many types of useful data ports for transferring digital data (para. 10, lines 3-14 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 20 and 46: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said media source comprises a cellular phone.

Hymel discloses a media source comprising a cellular phone (para. 10, lines 3-5 and lines 14-15 of Hymel).

Sugiyama and Hymel are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a cellular phone as the media source. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a cellular phone is one of many types of useful media data input devices that can be used (para. 10, lines 14-22 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 20 and 46.

Regarding claims 22 and 48: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the media source comprises a digital audio recorder.

Hymel discloses a media source comprising a digital audio recorder (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel).

Sugiyama and Hymel are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a digital audio recorder as the media source. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect another one of a variety of different types of peripheral devices, thus allowing the user to perform one more of a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with

Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 22 and 48.

12. Claims 17 and 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Dygert (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0048224 A1).

Regarding claim 17: Sugiyama discloses that the interface comprises a port for connecting to the peripheral device, the port selected from a group including composite video (luminance and chrominance signals) (column 3, lines 16-20 of Sugiyama) and component video (NTSC) (column 3, lines 12-14 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only composite video and component video, but also of SCSI, IDE, RJ11 and S-video.

Dygert discloses a port for connecting a peripheral device selected from one of SCSI (para. 50, lines 1-5 of Dygert), IDE (para. 50, lines 1-5 of Dygert), RJ11 (para. 27, lines 6-9 of Dygert) and S-video (para. 50, lines 9-15 of Dygert).

Sugiyama and Dygert are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to be able to further select between SCSI, IDE, RJ11 and S-video ports. The suggestion for doing so would have been that said ports are among some of the many available types of ports for transferring time-based media data (para. 27, lines 3-9 and para. 50, lines 1-6 of Dygert). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 27: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said multimedia system is configured to generate a web page representation of the multimedia.

Dygert discloses generating a web page representation of the multimedia (figure 5; para. 30, lines 1-4; and para. 52, lines 18-24 of Dygert).

Sugiyama and Dygert are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a web page representation of the multimedia, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been that, if a user has an internet connection, generating a web page is an easy way to obtain information regarding multimedia data (para. 7, lines 5-10 and lines 18-21 of Dygert). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

Regarding claims 28-29: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said multimedia processing system is configured to communicate with the media source.

Dygert discloses a multimedia processing system (figure 1 (10) of Dygert) that communicates with a media source (figure 1 (13); and para. 44, lines 1-2, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert), thus controlling the functionality of said media source (para. 44, lines 1-2, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert).

Sugiyama and Dygert are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the multimedia processing system communicatively interact

Art Unit: 2624

with the media source, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 28-29.

Regarding claim 30: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the multimedia processing system resides at least in part on the media source.

Dygert discloses performing multimedia processing operations on the media source (para. 44, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert). Thus, the multimedia processing system resides at least in part on the media source.

Sugiyama and Dygert are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to operate the multimedia processing system at least partly on the media source, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30.

Regarding claims 31-32: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the system is configured to automatically detect a communicative coupling of the media source and download multimedia data from the media source.

Dygert discloses automatically detecting a communicative coupling of the media source and download multimedia data from

Art Unit: 2624

the media source (para. 29, lines 1-3 and para. 31, lines 2-5 and lines 13-17 of Dygert).

Sugiyama and Dygert are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to automatically detect a communicative coupling of the media source and download multimedia data from the media source, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to automatically obtain the desired information when the information is needed (para. 31, lines 2-5 and lines 13-17 of Dygert). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 31-32.

Regarding claim 33: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises a database server.

Dygert discloses an interface (figure 1(28) of Dygert) comprising a database server (figure 1(13) and para. 27, lines 9-16 of Dygert).

Sugiyama and Dygert are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a database server as part of said interface, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

Art Unit: 2624

Further regarding claim 34: Dygert discloses that said database server comprises a music catalog (figure 5 and para. 22, lines 1-4 of Dygert).

Further regarding claim 35: Dygert discloses that said database server comprises a video database (para. 22, lines 1-4 of Dygert).

Further regarding claim 36: Dygert discloses that said database server comprises a web search engine (para. 32, lines 1-6 and para. 42, lines 1-3 of Dygert).

13. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1), Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1), and Gerber (US Patent 5,568,406).

Further regarding claim 19: Shieh discloses that the removable storage reader comprises a media reader selected from a group, wherein two of said group is a flash card reader (para. 16, lines 1-3 of Shieh) and a memory stick reader (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only a flash card reader, and a memory stick reader, but also a DVD reader, a CD reader, a computer disk reader, and an SD reader.

Hymel discloses a removable storage reader selected from among a DVD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), and a computer disk reader (para. 19, lines 8-9 of Hymel).

Art Unit: 2624

Sugiyama in view of Shieh is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a DVD reader, a CD reader, and a computer disk reader, as taught by Hymel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Shieh.

Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD reader, a flash card reader, a memory stick reader, a CD reader, and a computer disk reader, but also of an SD reader.

Gerber discloses storing digital data on an SD disk (column 10, lines 28-34 of Gerber).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel is combinable with Gerber because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection an SD disk. The motivation for doing so would have been that an SD disk is useful for backing up large amounts of digital data (column 10, lines 23-34 of Gerber). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gerber with Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

14. Claims 23 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view

Art Unit: 2624

of Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1), Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1) and Heilweil (US Patent 4,881,135).

Regarding claims 23 and 49: Sugiyama discloses that the media source comprises a media input selected from a group of a video cassette tape reader (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama), and a video capture device (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a video cassette tape reader and a video capture device, but also of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a flash card reader, a digital video recorder, and a meeting recorder.

Shieh discloses inputting digital media using a flash card reader (para. 16, lines 1-3 of Shieh).

Sugiyama and Shieh are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control and storage of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a flash card reader, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to input data to one of a plurality of different input devices, depending upon user need and desire (para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama.

Sugiyama in view of Shieh does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a video cassette tape reader, a video capture device, and a flash card reader, but also of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a digital video recorder, and a meeting recorder.

Art Unit: 2624

Hymel discloses a media input device selected from among a DVD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), an audio cassette tape reader (audio cassette tape reader is a type of audio player, MP3 player is merely an example) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel), and a digital video recorder (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, and a digital video recorder, as taught by Hymel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Shieh.

Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a video cassette tape reader, a video capture device, a flash card reader, and a digital video recorder, but also of a meeting recorder.

Heilweil discloses media input using a meeting recorder (figure 2 and column 3, lines 48-51 of Heilweil).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel is combinable with Heilweil because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 2624

ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection the meeting recorder taught by Heilweil. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide audio-visual data regarding a conference or a meeting in a concealed or discreet manner (column 2, lines 33-40 of Heilweil). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Heilweil with Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 23 and 49.

15. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Ohnishi (US Patent 4,807,186).

Regarding claim 26: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system generates digital printed data (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama) corresponding to a video segment in the video stream (column 3, lines 26-32 of Sugiyama).

Ohnishi discloses printing digital data as a bar code (column 2, lines 56-60 of Ohnishi).

Sugiyama and Ohnishi are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to print a video segment in the video stream, as taught by Sugiyama, as a bar code, as taught by Ohnishi. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a bar code is one of the convenient means by which digital data is stored and later read (column 2, lines 56-62 of Ohnishi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohnishi with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 26.

Art Unit: 2624

16. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Klatt (US Patent 4,754,485).

Regarding claim 37: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said multiprocessing system comprises a text-to-speech system.

Klatt discloses a text to speech system (figure 1 and column 3, lines 47-52 of Klatt).

Sugiyama and Klatt are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of time-based digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the text-to-speech system taught by Klatt as part of said multiprocessing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide phonetic output for ASCII-based media input (column 1, line 67 to column 2, line 1 of Klatt). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Klatt with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

JAT
05 August 2005



THOMAS D.
~~TELLY~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER